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In 1985 John Miles Foley authored as his first book-length work *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. This volume, which provided an introduction to the field of study and over 1800 annotated entries, was later supplemented by updates published in *Oral Tradition* (and compiled by John himself, Lee Edgar Tyler, Juris Dilevko, and Catherine S. Quick [with the assistance of Patrick Gonder, Sarah Feeny, Amerina Engel, Sheril Hook, and Rosalinda Villalobos Lopez]) that served both to summarize and to provide reflection upon new developments in an area of scholarship that eventually became too vast and broadly evolved to be contained by any single bibliographic venture. Given that John’s own work was instrumental in effecting this sustained development—while also having importance in so many other areas of study as well—it seems only fitting to close the current volume with an annotated bibliography of John’s works up through the current point in time.

In compiling this vast bibliography (which includes entries for nearly 200 essays, books, and other types of scholarly contributions), I have attempted to adhere to John’s own practice of providing full citations followed by a few sentences that summarize each item’s contents and its significance within the larger body of scholarship on oral traditions (or in some cases, within other fields as well). Additionally, I have continued his methodology of not annotating reviews of other scholars’ books unless those discussions themselves directly contributed to ongoing discourse in the field. Variations among entries with respect to capitalization or terminology are meant to reflect the specific usages within the annotated works themselves. For those works that have previously appeared in one of the bibliographies listed above, I have here reproduced those earlier versions without alteration (except for matters of style) and with much thanks to their original authors.


Presents evidence for the assignment of speech boundaries in Lyric VII (“Passus”) on the basis of verbal echo, which is shown to be an important feature of the poem’s composition.

Argues for the tradition-dependence of both formula and theme, that is, for their individual Old English character as well as cross-traditional features. A computer analysis of the meter of Beowulf reveals a level of metrical formularity which assists in selecting phraseological patterns. Themes take the tradition-dependent form of groups of repeated stressed morphs, again the result of a metrical scheme much different from those of Greek and Yugoslav oral epic. After redefinitions of formula and theme that suit both Old English and comparative oral tradition, the essay considers the aesthetic implications of such structures, contending that echoes proceed not from one occurrence to the next but along the lengthy traditional axis of the poetry as a whole, with traditional knowledge providing a sounding-board for each instance. Under this poetic aegis, “usefulness and aesthetics need no longer preclude one another’s existence; they merge in the ritual unity of traditional art” (232).


After providing a new edition for Riddle I, argues that the riddle’s common solution “storm” is actually only the metaphor (involving the poet’s vision of the Apocalypse) by which the real tripartite solution of God, Christ, and the Cross can be obtained.


A review of the two volumes (one focused on English translation and contextualization, and the other dedicated to the presentation of the poem in the original language), with emphasis on their value for the study of comparative epic traditions.


Text and translation of Udovica Jana (“The Widow Jana”) as performed in April 1954 by Aleksandar Jakovljević. Includes commentary on the performance context, meter, music, formulaic phraseology, and other traditional characteristics of the poem.

Starting from Havelock’s thesis (1963) on the encyclopedic function of oral epic, analyzes Beowulf for similarly inscribed patterns of psychological maturation, arguing that such patterns serve as continually repeated and thus generally available “reference works” on mental growth. As a digest of cultural knowledge, the poem performs a crucial kind of education: “The psychohistorical matrix which underlies and generates the epic narrative remains available to all members of the society through repeated oral performance; in this manner a symbolic ‘casebook’ on ontogenic and phylogenetic growth is quite literally ‘published’ in the medium of traditional song” (153).


A report of Foley-Halpern fieldwork in the Serbian village of Orašac and surrounding areas in 1975. Survey of various genres collected, including epic, lyric, charm, and genealogy, and of informants. Includes suggestions on comparison with poems in other oral traditions.


Proposes an archetypal unity—the act of entry and impregnation—underlying Riddles 53, 54, and 55 of the Exeter Book; this unity then provides the tripartite series with cultural significance that reaches beyond the immediate solution of any individual riddle.


Uses firsthand observations on Yugoslav oral epic performance, made during the Karadžić festival in Tršić in 1973, to explain the collectivity and group dynamics of the proems to Beowulf and the Odyssey. Includes photographs.


Places Peabody 1975 in the context of studies of oral theory in ancient Greek.

A comparison of written historical population records and traditional oral recall of family history from a Serbian village, with stress on the differences in mode and their implications for sociolinguistic investigation.


A report on a computer-assisted pattern search to determine the aural texture of Beowulf. Includes a description of the metrical formula, or “basic line” rhythm, preferred by the poet.


Discussion of psychohistorical patterns and their significance in Beowulf, the Odyssey, and Serbo-Croatian oral tradition (along the same lines as “Beowulf and the Psychohistory of Anglo-Saxon Culture” [1977]). Sees one dimension of oral epic as the process of acquiring and dispensing knowledge about the growth of the individual in a social context.


A study of conversations with and epic songs by Bajgorić, a Parry-Lord guslar, to compare (1) the folktale qualities of his description of the “greatest of singers” with the Old English accounts of the bards Widsith and Deor, (2) the Serbo-Croatian and Old English themes of the “heroic boast,” and (3) the Serbo-Croatian and ancient Greek themes of “Readying the Hero’s Horse” and “Feasting.” Emphasis is placed on the tradition-dependent character of the typical scene.


Traces the evolution of Raffel’s poetry from early examples (where aural concerns dominate) through later poems (with their heightened emphasis on narrative) to a developed stage (where the aural and narrative merge into a unified aesthetic). Includes a ‘performance text’ based on Raffel’s own performance of “Further Reflections on Existence, Manner, Mode, and Function.”

Analyzes four versions of this epic song by the Parry-Lord *guslar* in order to show (1) how, after a pause for rest, the singer will restart his song at a traditional boundary rather than midway through such a unit, and (2) how the story-pattern of Return, as a traditional multiform, can take many shapes. Includes specific comments on the permutation of recurrent story elements and on the flexible patterns that underlie traditional genre.


Criticizes Finnegan’s tautological method of including a great variety of forms and genres (among them epic, fully memorized material, and rock music) in what she calls “oral poetry” and then proclaiming the eclectic nature of her sample as evidence of the narrowness of the Parry-Lord and Bowra-Chadwick approaches.


A description of oral healing charms in Serbo-Croatian, with emphasis on the cultural significance of this verbal magic.


An analysis of variant texts of a charm against erysipelas as recorded by Kerewsky-Halpern and Foley in the Šumadijan region of Serbia. Attention is given to cultural context, linguistic and symbolic structure, mode of transmission, relationship among variants, and folkloric motifs. Serves to document and analyze another non-epic oral genre in Serbo-Croatian.


A plea for a tradition-dependent concept of formulaic structure in each poetic tradition. Notes that variance among formulaic dictions and their prosodies in Old English, ancient Greek, and Serbo-Croatian stems
from both synchronic generation rules and diachronic evolution. Mentions Indo-European tendencies preserved, and to some extent still functional, in the various meters.


Surveys Old English, Greek, and Serbo-Croatian materials (the last consisting of epic songs from the Milman Parry Collection) to illustrate tradition-dependence at three levels: formula, theme, and story-pattern. Reconstructs the argument for individual, literature-specific definitions of the formula; analyzes the Serbo-Croatian “Shouting in Prison” theme and the Old English “Sea Voyage” multiform from a comparative perspective on the twin criteria of narrative sequence and verbal correspondence; and considers the replication of the Return Song pattern in various avatars. Finds clear differences between the Serbo-Croatian and Old English themes, concluding that “neither the sea voyage nor ‘Shouting in Prison’ is less a theme for its similarity to or difference from its counterpart; rather each theme is actualized in a form governed by the prosody of the tradition involved” (133). Calls for a truly comparative scholarship willing to engage differences as well as the more obvious, and more often studied, similarities among traditions.


Using Serbo-Croatian charm texts collected in Serbia by Foley and Halpern in 1975 and the surviving corpus of Anglo-Saxon spells, studies the role of sound patterns from a comparative point of view. Notes the role of prosodic factors, optional and required phonemic sequences, rhetorical patterns, and so on, and then extends the comparison to epic forms.


A comparison of “triplets” (units of a line and one-half) in Old English and Serbo-Croatian, the former three verses or half-lines and the latter three halves of the symmetrical octosyllable typical of charms and lyric (women’s) songs. Argues that both the line and the half-line must be recognized as viable metrical units and that the usual configuration of whole lines is occasionally overridden by compositional considerations such as sound-patterning and verbal echo. Broadens the study of repeated words to a traditional structure called “responson.”

A brief bibliographical survey of oral literature research, with emphasis on scholarship treating ancient Greek and medieval European traditions and a section on new directions with more extensive discussion.


Considers the nature and logic of comparison among oral poetries, stressing the need to apply the principles of tradition- and genre-dependence in order to make more exact distinctions and to fine-tune aesthetic criticism.


Proposes solving the problem of variant and equally authoritative texts of an oral work by employing a computerized text-processor that “reads” all variants simultaneously, giving priority to no single text. The program locates formulaic and thematic correspondences and sets them alongside each other, thus recreating the multifomity characteristic of an oral traditional work. Includes examples of the operation of the program upon South Slavic oral texts from the Milman Parry Collection.


A four-part history, consisting of (1) Milman Parry and the Homeric Question, (2) Albert Lord and the Oral Traditional Question (an analytical review of his writings), (3) The Oral Theory and Old English Poetry (a history of formulaic criticism in Old English from 1878-1980), and (4) New Directions.


Extends comparative oral theory in Old English and Serbo-Croatian from epic to charm, using examples from the Anglo-Saxon spells and Serbian collections made by the author and Barbara Kerewsky-Halpern. The comparison treats the Indo-European roots of the verb “to charm” in both languages, so-called “nonsense” charms that exhibit sound-patterning, onomastics, formulaic structure, and syntactic frames. Argues that the power of the spells derives in large part from these features common to the two traditions and that “the ultimate source of that power lies in incantation and ritual speech” (38).

Using an example of story-pattern evolution in the repertoire of the Parry-Lord guslar Mujo Kukuruzović, explains problems of unity in Beowulf (especially the seam at lines 2199-2200) and the Odyssey (the double council of the gods in Books 1 and 5).


Suggests a critical methodology for approaching various ancient, medieval, and modern texts either known or thought to be orally composed. Describes a five-part reading program: (1) the question of “text” (manuscript, taped recording, or other medium), (2) oral (unambiguously) or oral-derived, (3) the criterion of genre-dependence, (4) the matching criterion of tradition-dependence, and (5) the synchronic and diachronic contexts. Illustrates the discriminations made possible by such a program by applying its principles to five example texts or groups of texts: Serbo-Croatian oral epic, the Odyssey, Serbo-Croatian and Old English charms, Beowulf, and the shorter Old English poem The Seafarer.


Re-examines the question of formulaic structure in Old English, ancient Greek, and Serbo-Croatian, concentrating on a true comparison of the three meters and their phraseologies by noting differences alongside similarities. Emphasis is placed on the colonic, caesura-bound encapsulation typical of the Homeric and Yugoslav poetic lines, in contrast to the foregrounding of stressed items and rhythmic (but nonsyllabic) patterns characteristic of the Old English alliterative line. Combining these distinctions with earlier work on metrical systems, Foley offers a new definition of the Old English formula founded on the principle of tradition-dependence: “a recurrent substitutable phrase one half-line in length which results from the intersection of two compositional parameters—a morphemic focus at positions of metrical stress and a limited number of metrical formulas” (274, italics deleted).

Editor. Oral Tradition, a special issue of Canadian-American Slavic Studies, 15.1.

Eight essays on oral traditional literature, with emphasis on structure and genre.

A contextual history of oral theory, bibliography of Lord’s writings to date, preface by Robert P. Creed, and nineteen essays on various oral literatures by Patricia Arant, David E. Bynum, Francelia Clark, Robert P. Creed, Joanne De Lavan, Joseph J. Duggan, John Miles Foley, Donald K. Fry, William Gonzalez, Joseph Harris, Edward R. Haymes, Barbara Kerewsky-Halpern, Deirdre La Pin, John S. Miletich, Gregory Nagy, John D. Niles, Alain Renoir, and Bruce A. Rosenberg. Also included is an essay by Lord.


In order to solve the problem of exclusive concentration either on oral traditional structure or on aesthetics, two aspects of oral or oral-derived poetries that critics have understood as contradictory and mutually exclusive, suggests a comparison not between the long Moslem epic and either *Beowulf* or the *Odyssey,* but rather between the shorter poems in Old English (for instance, *The Wanderer* or *The Seafarer*) and in Serbo-Croatian (the Vuk Karadžić poems). Shows that the Serbo-Croatian oral poet is capable of manipulating traditional structures to his personally conceived aesthetic advantage, an ability long recognized in the Old English poet but thought incompatible with oral tradition. Concludes that orality and conscious verbal artistry should not automatically be separated, and that in genres other than the long epic they can and do coexist.


A shorter account of the project more fully described in “Editing Oral Texts: Theory and Practice” (1981). The present report also suggests extensions to Old English and ancient Greek epic.


A report on the Foley-Halpern research on oral culture in Serbia in 1975, with summaries of analyses completed to date and work in progress.

After discussing the fourteenth century as a time of great religious, political, and social turmoil in Europe, offers an overview of the verbal art that was produced in the midst of such sweeping change. Special mention is made of Arthurian legend, the Alliterative Revival, and issues of genre and originality; *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, and *The Canterbury Tales* of Geoffrey Chaucer receive particularly detailed treatment.


Demonstrates the individuality as well as the similarity of the Old English alliterative line to the Homeric hexameter and Serbo-Croatian decasyllable from both synchronic and diachronic points of view. Observes that the ancient Greek and Serbo-Croatian lines are mora- or syllable-count meters, while the Old English prosodeme is the stress, and that Old English verse has no true caesura and therefore no colonic structure. Traces the Indo-European features of quantity/syllabicity, caesura, and increasing metrical conservatism toward line-end (“right-justification”) in all three meters where operative.


A humorous yet forceful exhortation that colleagues focus their academic efforts on learning and teaching—the two activities most dear to the Clerk in the *Canterbury Tales*—in an effort to better the future of their profession. Adapted from an oral presentation to faculty and alumni at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst in 1982.


Considers two modes of generating meaning in the Old English *Seafarer*—the traditional patterns that derive from a Germanic oral past and the poet’s personal designs—that are woven into a single poetic fabric. Argues that these complementary modes, when viewed from a Receptionalist perspective, comprise not a planctus, peregrination, or any of the usual assortment of medieval genres into which the poem is forced, but rather an idiosyncratic “genre-in-the-making,” a poetic type unique to Anglo-Saxon England in the period of transition from oral to oral-derived verbal art.

After providing a short biography of Ibro Bašić and a summary of “Alagić Alija and Velagić Selim” (a song recorded in three versions by Parry and Lord), investigates the structuring of the song on the levels of story-pattern, themes, and sub-thematic units.


Begins by considering the differences between the Moslem epic tradition of the South Slavs, on which the Parry-Lord oral theory is based, and the Christian tradition of much shorter epic songs, stressing the fact that the Christian songs provide an opportunity for a poet to manipulate inherited traditional patterns of language and narrative. The Christian songs thus exhibit both oral provenance and “literary” aesthetics, a combination that does not exist in the Moslem material and which therefore was thought to be impossible in other oral traditions. The Christian poems are then compared to shorter Old English poems, such as the elegies, which also combine literary art and the elements of oral tradition.

Editor. *East European Folklore*. A special issue of Southeastern Europe, 10.

A special issue of Southeastern Europe comprising seven essays on various aspects of eastern European folklore, with the majority of the essays focusing on Serbian traditions in particular.


Details several of the socially and poetically influenced characteristics of orally transmitted genealogies from Orašac and illustrates how several of those features shape written versions of the genealogies while other factors (such as population stability and gender issues) at the same time cause divergence between the written and oral accounts.


A general account of what is known or can be discerned about the Anglo-Saxon oral tradition from which Beowulf emerges.

Advances the idea of a reader-response approach to the literary epic, exemplified by *Moby-Dick,* and the oral traditional epic the *Odyssey,* an approach which must take into consideration the genre and mythic pattern of each work. Discusses *Moby-Dick* in terms of its genre (literary epic) and mythic patterns (the mythic qualities of the American whaling venture and the Promethean qualities of Ahab) and describes the traditional Indo-European epic structure of the “Return Song,” the performance nature of the oral tradition, and the value of the Serbo-Croatian analog in developing a reading context for the *Odyssey:* “To the extent that we faithfully recognize phraseological, narrative, and tale-type features as traditional and read the *Odyssey* in their light, we are becoming that original Homeric audience by according these reading signals their echoic due and by reinvesting them with their traditional significance” (443). Narration, a problem in *Moby-Dick,* provides for complexity and various levels of structure, but “at the necessary expense of a seemingly peripatetic, restless narrator” (446), while the *Odyssey*’s dialectical tension between the synchronic nature of performance and the diachrony of that performance’s traditional context “is both the reward and the price of narrative fiction” (447) in the oral tradition.

1985  

Provides a brief biography of Aeschylus as well as annotations of selected criticism concerning the poet’s works.


Provides a short discussion and selected bibliography of *Beowulf* criticism with particular focus on questions of authorship by the anonymous *Beowulf*-poet. Argues that the poem itself should be viewed as the product of several ages, traditions, and influences, all of which should be taken into consideration alongside the recognition of any contribution by the anonymous poet who brought the work into its surviving version.


Discusses the uncertain biographical details of Cynewulf, and then provides a brief overview of critical sources and scholarship for the poet.

The introduction contains a comprehensive history of scholarship and research in the field from its beginnings through 1982 and offers as suggestions for future work three methodological principles for comparative criticism: tradition-dependence, a recognition of the unique features of each oral poetic tradition which in comparing works from different traditions “admits both similarities and differences concurrently, which places the general characteristics of oral structures alongside the particular forms they may take in a given literature” (69); genre-dependence, “demanding as grounds for comparison among traditions nothing less than the closest generic fit available, and, further, calibrating any and all comparisons according to the comparability of the genres examined” (69), a principle which also “encourages comparison of genres if a basic congruity can be established” (69); and text-dependence, “the necessity to consider the exact nature of each text” (69) including the circumstances surrounding the collection, transmission, editing processes, and text diplomacy. The bibliography contains a comprehensive list of annotations on studies through 1982 in 100 language areas, as well as theory, bibliography, concordance, film, and music.


A companion to earlier articles on establishing computerized editions of oral epic, this article presents examples of the phraseological and narrative analyses made possible by the text-processor HEURO.

In Serbian. “Indoevropski metar i srpskohrvatski deseterac.” Naučni Sastanak Slavista u Vukove Dane, 15:339-44.

A brief description of the Indo-European background of the South Slavic decasyllable and of the implications of that history for the prosody and phraseology of the Serbo-Croatian oral epic. References to other Indo-European meters are included.


Suggests that oral traditional units in texts are not complete within the text but are rather “incomplete cues to be contextualized by the audience’s subjective participation in the tale-telling process” (217). Applies the methodology resulting from this concept to the “pan-Balkan” story form of the return song.

Collection of essays considering how we “read” works of literature that stem from oral traditions, and what difference a work’s orality makes to its interpretation. Includes introduction and selected bibliography by Foley.


A two-part article that advocates consideration of traditional elements, such as the formula, in their own context before comparative analysis or any attempt to understand meaning. The first half outlines three principles for analysis of folk epic in context and applies them to the South Slavic formula: tradition-dependence, genre-dependence, and text-dependence. The second half discusses the principle of metonymy, according to which the meaning of traditional elements resides not necessarily in the text itself, but in the extratextual connotations invoked by the text.


Considers how oral traditional epic encodes not only the practical life-knowledge of a culture, but also “the drama about psychological maturation—the record a culture maintains . . . about the secrets of the human psyche in its development from birth to adulthood” (94). Employs the return song in ancient Greek and South Slavic as the primary example.


Contends that “a bona fide reading [of an oral text] requires isolation . . . of exactly what the poet and tradition are communicating to their audiences through the mutually intelligible symbol” (190). Considers the place of meaning in oral art, seeking to balance out the scholarly emphasis on structure and to answer the literary critics’ objections to the idea of an oral art by suggesting that stock formulas function metonymically, that they explain the “momentary action in terms of the larger characterization, the present in terms of the timeless and unchanging” (193).

Interdisciplinary and cross-cultural collection of essays honoring the memory of Milman Parry as the founder of the field of oral tradition studies.


After exploring some of the difficulties in defining the terms “oral” and “traditional,” proposes a specific program for reading traditional texts (as opposed to literary works) by considering questions of what is actually represented by a given text, where the work lies on the oral and oral-derived spectrum, how issues of genre- and tradition-dependence are important, and how the work is situated with regard to both synchronic and diachronic contexts. This program is then applied to examples drawn from South Slavic epic, the *Odyssey*, Serbo-Croatian and Old English charms, *Beowulf*, and *The Seafarer*. This essay later appears in only slightly altered form as Chapter 1 of *Traditional Oral Epic* (1990). (A summary in Serbian is also provided at the end of the essay.)


A comprehensive history of oral-formulaic theory, beginning with the pre-Parry debates over the Homeric question, through the studies of Parry and Lord, and concluding by discussing the impact these studies have had on diverse and interdisciplinary fields, as well as the contributions to the theory itself from these other fields.


Extends the argument of Gellrich (“Orality, Literacy, and Crisis in the Later Middle Ages,” *Philological Quarterly, 67*:461-73, 480) to the realm of aesthetics, noting that the persistence of oral-derived structures in medieval texts results from their metonymic utility in encoding meaning that has reference to a larger tradition.

Listed bibliographical entries in each area meant to act as a recommended core collection for undergraduate libraries.


Considers the roles of traditional metonymy and extratextual resonances—especially in relation to aesthetics—as important on various structural levels within the traditional poems collected by Karadžić in the early nineteenth century.


An introduction to a volume comprising the proceedings of the CENSAL Symposium held in July 1986 at the University of Natal. Suggests that research on various African traditions can further inform our understanding of traditional (though often now text-bound) materials from other areas of the world and then proceeds to draw specific connections between each of the volume’s essays and ongoing scholarship from many of these comparative fields of study.


Begins the process of developing a traditional oral poetics by which to understand the structural and aesthetic principles underlying oral and oral-derived texts. Applies this methodology to a comparative study of the *Odyssey*, South Slavic return songs, and *Beowulf*.


Collection of reprinted texts that touch “in some important way on the origin, evolution, or response to oral-formulaic theory” (xiv).


Contextualizes the volume it introduces as part of an exploding movement to extend Parry and Lord’s theories to multitudinous oral traditions from around the world; also acknowledges the importance of the editors’ synthesis of firsthand fieldwork with scholarly analysis and commentary that explains the cultural significance of the materials included.


Building on the investigation into traditional structure presented in Traditional Oral Epic (1990) and also upon the Receptionalist approach to literary criticism, seeks to answer the question of how we might better “interpret works of verbal art that either stem directly from or have roots in oral tradition” (xi) by understanding them on their own terms rather than through a primarily literary lens. Such texts can best be seen as generating meaning through the process of traditional referentiality whereby any given usage of a traditional element draws metonymically from the surrounding poetic tradition via the previous experiences of both poet and audience. Later chapters are then devoted to examining the benefits of recognizing such traditional referentiality in connection with the formulas, themes, and story-patterns of the Serbo-Croatian, ancient Greek, and Old English traditions.


Rejects the extreme positions associated with the Great Divide model whereby oral-derived texts (such as those in the ancient Greek or Old English traditions) are either held to be perfectly similar to modern oral traditions (such as those of Yugoslavia) or are denied their oral traditional roots altogether. Instead calls for investigative approaches for such texts to be complicated in a way that looks at both similarities and differences across traditions while also reaching beyond matters of composition so that issues of aesthetics and meaning are taken into account.

Advances a methodology that combines Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Performance/Ethnopoetics/Ethnography of Speaking approach in order to create English-language renderings of Serbo-Croatian oral narratives, particularly the *narodne pjesme* collected by Karadžić in the early nineteenth century. As an example of what can be achieved through such a methodology, the process is then applied to a single poem from the collection (*Marko Kraljević Recognizes His Father’s Sword*) by means of a translation and subsequent commentary.


Advocates a pluralistic approach toward understanding Old English verse in terms of “its oral traditional as well as its written heritage and dynamics” (141), and briefly traces the oral-formulaic approach as previously employed (or rejected) in Old English studies before demonstrating how the theory can be expanded beyond issues of composition to take reception, aesthetics, and metonymic meaning into account as well. Concludes with a “Further Reading” section that includes relevant bibliography.


A conversation with the editor about oral tradition in the former Yugoslavia and worldwide.


An obituary focusing on the ways in which Lord built upon the insights of Milman Parry and thus “changed the way we think about verbal art, profoundly and permanently” (59). Includes a full bibliography of Lord’s many publications.


A discussion of aesthetics within oral and oral-derived texts excerpted in large part from Chapters 1-3 of *Immanent Art* (1991).

A continuation and extension of earlier work on aesthetics, with the explicit argument that aesthetics and structure are complementary and mutually enabling features within oral and oral-derived works rather than oppositional forces as posited by various earlier scholars. Suggests that issues of tradition-dependence, genre-dependence, and text-dependence are all important in creating meaning in such art, and provides examples from ancient Greek (Homeric Bath type-scenes), South Slavic (the Search for a Substitute theme within the Return Song story-pattern, and Old English (the scourging theme in *Andreas*) that show how traditional structures act metonymically in the individual instance to evoke larger meanings drawn from the surrounding tradition.


After describing the South Slavic institutions of bloodbrother-, bloodsister-, and godparenthood, goes on to demonstrate how an understanding of these institutions can better inform interpretation of Christian epics such as “Marko Kraljević Recognizes His Father’s Sword” (with its narration of the pact between the wounded Vukašin and the Turkish maiden [or her brother]) and the Moslem Return Song (where a cognate relationship between the prisoner and the *banica* is formed within the “Shouting in Prison” theme).


Illustrates through examples drawn especially from Serbo-Croatian traditions (but also from Greek and Old English) how Oral-Formulaic Theory and Performance-centered approaches can be combined to understand the concept of “word-power,” with performance acting as an enabling event that activates the referential sphere of the tradition itself.


A collection of 27 essays presented to Alain Renoir and covering the areas of Greek, Latin, Middle English, Middle High German, Old English, Old French, Old High German, Old Irish, Old Norse, Russian, Sanskrit, Serbo-Croatian, Welsh, and Xhosa traditions. Most essays focus particularly on oral traditions or oral-derived texts. A bibliography of Alain Renoir’s works up to that point is also included.

A fond remembrance and academic biography of Lord published shortly after the death of the pioneering scholar.


A discussion of traditional referentiality largely excerpted from Ch. 1 of *Immanent Art* (1991).


A synthesized review of six volumes (*Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* [Timothy Gantz, 1993], *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet* [Barry B. Powell, 1991], *Literacy and Orality*...
in Ancient Greece [Rosalind Thomas, 1992], Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad [James V. Morrison, 1992], The Stranger’s Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene [Steve Reece, 1993], and Pindar’s Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past [Gregory Nagy, 1990]) in an effort to provide an overview of “some recent developments in ancient Greek studies that collectively portend major shifts in scholarly response to issues that involve—and that also, significantly, further interrelate—folklore and literature” (438).


Examines the figures of Pelt Kid and Tale of Orašac (from the Zuni storytelling and South Slavic Moslem epic traditions respectively) as illustrations of the importance of metonymic “word-power” within traditional performance contexts.


After an introduction that discusses the importance of oral traditions and the difficulty of the designation “oral literature,” provides a selection of readings drawn from Rajasthani, Sephardic, Jewish, Arabic, Malagasy, Russian, South Slavic, Mayan, Native American, Appalachian, and African-American traditions, each of which is discussed briefly with respect to its own particular cultural context.


Examines the traditional referentiality of four proverbs drawn from South Slavic epics recorded by Parry and Lord in the 1930s.


Proposes that the usefulness of South Slav oral tradition as a tool for comparative study can be increased by “differentiating among traditions, genres and even documents” (97) and suggests that such comparisons can be nuanced by focusing on issues of text-dependence, tradition-dependence, and genre-dependence before further fine-tuning can be accomplished by investigating specialized features of individual idiolect, local dialect, and pan-traditional language.

As a response to Werner Kelber’s call (made previously in the same volume) for “an increased complexity in our concept of oral tradition as applied to the origins, history, and phenomenological reality of the Gospel texts” (169), provides comparative insights on metonymic referentiality, sociolinguistic register, and shifts in audience reception that might in turn be applied to the Gospels by specialists in that field.

1995  

An account of the history, achievements, and especially the methodologies of scholarly editing within the field of folk literature. After a brief sketch of early editing methodologies reaching back to the Grimms, Lönnrot, and Karadžić and proceeding through periods dominated by ethnolinguistic models (Powell, Boas, Sapir, Malinowski, Mallery) and literary models (Thompson, Taylor), demonstrates how editing after 1960 employed different methodologies in attempts at better appreciating folk literature on its own terms. Particular focus is placed on Oral-Formulaic Theory (Parry, Lord), Ethnopoetics/Ethnography of Speaking (Tedlock, Rothenberg, Hymes), and Performance approaches (Bauman, with parallel theoretical developments in various areas of folklore), and Barre Toelken’s work on Navajo tales from 1961 onward is used as an illustration of such developments. Also provides a list of exemplary editions since 1960 and suggestions for further reading.


Argues that 1) the *Andreas* poet draws on the persistent qualities of traditional forms in order to create an “‘indexed translation,’ in which the story told in the *Praxeis* or a close relative becomes a work of identifiably and aesthetically Anglo-Saxon verbal art” (54), and 2) the poet’s self-interruption (lines 1478-91) must be understood as negotiating the levels of performance he has created within his text through the skillful employment of his traditional register.


A volume that continues the work of *Traditional Oral Epic* (1990) and *Immanent Art* (1991) by exploring the connections between oral-formulaic and performance-based theories as they apply to oral and oral-derived texts. Chapter 1 (“Common Ground”) begins the laying of a theoretical foundation for the study by elucidating points of contact between Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Ethnography of Speaking/ Ethnopoetics approaches. Chapter 2 (“Ways of Speaking, Ways of Meaning”) then extends this foundation to incorporate Receptionalism and the concepts of performance arena, register, and communicative economy, while Chapter 3 (“The Rhetorical Persistence of Traditional Forms”) explores the ways in which oral traditional art can retain performance-based meaning even past the point of transition into written
form. The last three chapters (“Spellbound,” “Continuities of Reception,” and “Indexed Translation”) then apply this established theoretical framework to the Serbian tradition of charms (bajanje), the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, and the Old English Andreas.


Demonstrates that within Homer the phrase οἱ δ’ ἄριστος πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ (“and all of them were stricken silently to silence”) acts as a traditional marker signifying a sequence in which “an initial speech proposing or reporting a radical, usually unexpected action will give way to stunned silence, followed by a response that immediately or eventually involves substantial qualification if not dismissal of the proposed or reported action” (23). In the *Iliad*, the phrase is further situated within contexts involving the winning or losing of kleos.


Seeks to calibrate more finely the benefits and limitations of comparing Homeric poetry with South Slavic oral epic by examining similarities and differences between the two traditions’ formulaic phraseology, enjambment practices, metrical irregularities, and “artificial language” qualities including dialect variation and archaisms.


A modified lecture illustrating the benefits (and limitations) of using South Slavic epic as an analogy for Homeric poetry, especially in relation to its performance.


First provides a brief overview of Oral-Formulaic Theory as it evolved from focusing primarily on composition to the inclusion of other aspects of performance including register, meaning, and reception more generally. As an illustration of the “potential yield of yoking together the concerns of folklore and literature studies in a unified perspective” (26), then discusses Bellerophon’s tablet from Book 6 of the *Iliad* as well as the term sêma more broadly within Homer as examples that demonstrate traditional, metonymic strategies for creating meaning in ways that often diverge from conventional literary techniques.

Brief overviews and bibliographic references for each entry.


A brief summary of Lord’s professional career and his important contributions to scholarship on oral traditions.


Demonstrates consistencies between Homeric epic and the Homeric Hymns in their employment of metonymic and extratextual poetic strategies with regard to both phraseology (especially the phrase *kratus Argeïphontês*) and type-scenes (particularly the “Suspicion of death and self-defilement” pattern).


Provides a history of the origins and evolution of Oral Theory as developed within studies of Homeric epic, proceeding from the early research of Parry and Lord to later replies and revisions. Concludes by considering the implications of oral tradition for interpreting Homer’s art, with particular emphasis on reception, traditional referentiality, and register.


Expanded version of “Oral Tradition and Homeric Art: The Hymn to Demeter” (1997) with increased emphasis on dialectal and idiolectal variation as well as further consideration of story-pattern structuring in the *Hymn to Demeter*.

A condensed version of Chapter 3 from *The Singer of Tales in Performance* (1995). After reviewing how various strategies have been used to commit particular oral traditions (for instance, Native American and South Slavic) to a printed (and often translated) form with differing degrees of success in preserving performance-related features and meanings, proceeds to explain that “the continuity of reception of a work that stems from oral tradition but which survives only as a text will depend on the reader’s ability to recognize the rhetorical signals that are the bequest of performance and tradition, and then to credit these signals with the institutionalized meanings they carry as a dedicated register of verbal communication” (17).


After a brief overview of oral tradition studies (with particular emphasis on theoretical developments related specifically to the Homeric tradition and detailing the specific progression in scholarship from concerns of composition to those associated with reception and meaning), discusses in detail the traditional presence and persistence of metonymic meanings and traditionally referentiality inherent within the formulas, type-scenes, and story-patterns of various traditions. Concludes with a demonstration that in Homer the word *sêma* designates a “sign that points not so much to a specific situation, text, or performance as toward the ambient tradition, which serves as a key to an emergent reality” (56), thus functioning as a specific example of the way in which traditional “signs” work more generally within such traditional poetries.


“Formula” discusses the original definition of the term by Parry and then its gradual expansion as related to “formulaic systems” and further traditions beyond those studied by Parry. “Oral-Formulaic Theory” is discussed in its larger developments from its conception by Parry through its application by Lord and the eventual refinements that were made to the theory in the areas of performance, reception, and meaning. “Themes” discusses Lord’s work with these items in particular while also mentioning Parry’s initial usage of the term and other scholars’ application of the concept to traditions from around the world. Each entry also provides relevant bibliography.


A brief overview of the development of Oral Theory from the time of its earliest formulation by Parry and Lord to its eventual application to traditions from around the world and also to its inclusion of concerns about reception, register, and meaning as well as composition.


An application of Ong’s conception of the “fictionalized audience” to “traditional oral performers, regardless of gender, age, genre, or culture” (93) as well as to works existing now only as written records that reflect such traditional performance. Posits that a heightened effectiveness of the traditional register requires the bard and audience to be joined in co-creating a work of art through a communicative economy that itself relies on mutual awareness of traditional signals.


Provides an overview of oral traditions in connection with their effectiveness as technologies of communication. Begins by investigating the pervasiveness of oral traditions—even when occurring alongside other (for instance, written) communication technologies—as well as the idea that it is better to see orality and literacy as theoretical ends of a broad spectrum of possibilities rather than to try separating them out into a false dichotomy. The essay then proceeds by discussing the role of tradition itself for the communicative process: “Tradition provides the pluralism that contextualizes the singular performance; the series of potentials to which the performer’s signals refer; the mythic background that gives dimension and reality to the citation of characters, events and developments” (22). Finally, the concepts of performance arena, register, and communicative economy are discussed as features giving rise to meaning through the process of traditional referentiality. Throughout the essay, the focus is on ancient Greek, South Slavic, and Anglo-Saxon traditions, but frequent reference is made to many other comparative traditions as well.

After showing that many preconceptions about the idea of a “canon” derive from the realities of physical libraries (such as the one at ancient Alexandria) requiring static objects to be included as entries, goes on to show that such “canons” can never encapsulate the plurality and multiformity of oral traditions themselves. Instead, such traditions work similarly to the Internet with its ever-changing and user-individualized pathways to information. The Internet model is then used to demonstrate another aspect of oral traditions, as the traditional referentiality of traditional units is shown to work similarly to the process of clicking an Internet link that then opens onto a fuller reality than is expressed in the typed-out form of the URL itself.


Provides a comparison of Homer with the “legendary singer” figure of South Slavic oral epic with the goals of demonstrating 1) how the legendary singer is employed as a way of designating the poetic tradition more generally, 2) that descriptions of the legendary singer illustrate the concept of “variation within limits,” thus mirroring the traditions themselves, and 3) that understanding the significance of the different legendary singer figures involves viewing them as representations of “both their individual, situation-specific and their traditional values” (150).


Justifies the need for a volume devoted to the teaching of oral traditions by demonstrating that 1) the subject is one of increasing importance within the undergraduate classroom and 2) it requires a fundamental shift away from the academic norms associated with most text-based analysis. Also provides a contextualizing summary of the volume’s contents.


Argues that even though much meaning is often lost as oral epics are removed from performance and molded into fixed texts, comparison of textualized epics having roots in oral performance (such as those in the ancient Greek and medieval English traditions) with living oral traditions can still be fruitful; some traditionally encoded meanings will bridge the transition from oral to written based on continued appreciation of such signals by both poet and audience, but their degree of persistence will be affected by the particular relationship between a given text and its traditional performance context. The variability of such relationships is then explored through examples drawn from Native American, South Slavic, ancient Greek, and medieval English traditions.

An introduction to a volume devoted to investigating structures and patterns within ancient Greek and Roman oral traditions, with a specific goal of understanding how and/or what such features contribute to meaning and aesthetics. Begins by discussing the evolution of Oral-Formulaic Theory as it moved away from the Great Divide model toward an understanding of oral traditions that foregrounds plurality, reception, and traditional referentiality. Proceeds by providing several homemade proverbs to be kept in mind when investigating oral traditions, with one underlying theme being that of emphasizing further the “traditional” component of the “oral traditional” label. Finally, the introduction provides a contextualization and summary of each of the volume’s contributed essays.


The entries on Lord and Parry focus on their backgrounds, fieldwork, and development of Oral-Formulaic Theory. The third entry explores Oral-Formulaic Theory in more detail, also discussing its later evolution to focus on further traditions and especially performance without an “absolute dichotomy of oral versus written” (474).


A collection of 39 essays (plus an introduction by Foley) centered on the teaching of oral traditions, particularly within the undergraduate classroom. Part I (“Canon or Cornucopia”) consists of four essays that examine how oral traditions fit (or do not fit) into normative modern conceptions of verbal art. Special emphasis is placed on continuities between oral traditions and the Internet (Foley); the need for adapting our ideas concerning comparative literature to include both oral and written traditions (Lee Haring); the confluence of orality, literacy, and gesture within medieval manuscripts (Katherine O’Brien O’Keefe); and the transition of oral traditions into textualized form (Elizabeth Fine).

Part II (“Critical Approaches”) then comprises five essays that discuss a particular methodology or methodologies relevant to studying and teaching oral traditions. Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt and Mark C. Amodio provide historical and modern overviews of many of these approaches before specific investigations are made into the Ethnography of Performance (Richard Bauman and Donald Braid), Ethnopoetics (Thomas DuBois), and Traditional Referentiality (Nancy Mason Bradbury).

The essays in Part III then demonstrate how these techniques can be employed to teach specific traditions. Covered living traditions include Native American North (Barre Toelken) and South (John H. McDowell), African oral narrative (Donald J. Cosentino), African American (Sw. Anand Prahlad), General Hispanic (John Zemke), Mexican American (María Herrera-Sobek), Jewish (Judith S. Neulander), Indian (R. Parthasarathy), Chinese (Mark Bender), Japanese (Shelley Fenno Quinn), Arabic (Susan Slyomovics), South Slavic (Ronelle Alexander), British-American balladry (John D. Niles), folktales (Steven Swann...
Jones), women’s expressive forms (Marta Weigle), and storytelling (Carol L. Birch). Also covered are texts with roots in oral tradition, including the Hebrew Scriptures (Martin S. Jaffee), New Testament texts (Werner H. Kelber), Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey (Richard P. Martin), Beowulf (Alexandra H. Olsen), Chaucer (Carl Lindahl), the Middle English romance and alliterative tradition (Leslie Stratynor), Old French literature (Evelyn Birge Vitz), the Icelandic sagas (Joseph Harris), and the frame tale (Bonnie D. Irwin).

Part IV closes the volume by providing further resources and background for teaching these traditions. A synthesis of a nationwide curriculum survey is presented by Lynn C. Lewis and Lori Peterson; Beverly Stoeltje and Nancy Worthington offer strategies for incorporating issues of multiculturalism within the teaching of these materials; William McCarthy demonstrates how oral traditions can be used beneficially within a composition course; and Anastasios Daskalopoulos offers a selected bibliography of audiovisual and Internet resources meant to assist teachers and students of these traditions. Finally, the collected bibliography that forms the “Works Cited” section of the volume is itself a valuable resource.


A collection of essays based on papers delivered at the Eleventh Congress of the International Society for Folk-Narrative Research held in Mysore, India, during January 1995. Topics covered include oral epic composition, the relationship of epics and history, and the interface between oral and written epic techniques, with particular focus on Indian, Tibetan, Irish, Greenlandic, and Homeric traditions among others.


Argues that the concept of an “epic cycle” is for the most part a product of a textually oriented outlook rather than one that reflects emic practices. Further suggests that, even though establishing such frameworks is helpful for critical analysis, substitution of “tradition” for “cycle” in such investigations will lead to more fruitful results.


A combined review of The Siri Epic as Performed by Gopala Naika, Parts I and II (L. Honko in collaboration with C. Gowda, A. Honko, and V. Rai. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1998) and Textualising the Siri Epic (L. Honko. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1998), with special emphasis on placing the epic itself within a comparative context. Issues addressed include epic register and idiolect, performance, the oral-dictation process (with its effect on the epic’s structure and content),
translation techniques, and the definition of “epic” more generally. Also included is a particular critique (both positive and negative) on Honko’s usage of the term “mental text.”

“14 or 40? The Singer or the Editor.” Journal of American Folklore, 112:555-57.

A response to R. Alexander’s review (Journal of American Folklore, 111:442-44) of Immanent Art and The Singer of Tales in Performance, geared specifically at interacting with Alexander’s claim that Foley mistranscribed and mistranslated the number “40” as “14” as found within The Wedding of Mustajbeg’s Son Bećirbeg performed by Halil Bajgorić. Explains that the poet did indeed sing “14,” and the number was thus transcribed and translated accordingly without any editorial license being exercised to “correct” what could be viewed as a possible infelicity.


A volume devoted to answering the question “What difference does oral tradition make to our understanding of the Iliad and Odyssey?” Part I begins the study by investigating the nature of Homeric sêmata (“signs”), both with respect to those items so designated within the epics themselves but also in reference to Homer’s formulas and other “signs” that are encoded with extralexical, metonymic meanings provided by the surrounding tradition. Part II (consisting of Chapters 2-4) then explores in great detail the advantages and limitations of the South Slavic analogy for understanding Homeric poetry, with specific discussions of the figure of the traditional singer, specialized language within the traditions, and the process by which the South Slavic tradition encodes its own “signs” with traditional referentiality. Analysis turns toward the Homeric poems in particular in Part III, with Chapter 5 considering the implications of the Return Song as the story-pattern that underlies the Odyssey and thus heightens the possibly ambiguous nature of Penelope within that epic. Chapter 6 tightens the focus more narrowly by moving down to the level of the type-scene, devoting particular attention to feasts in the Odyssey and laments in the Iliad. Chapter 7 then proceeds to look at even smaller traditional units and meaning embedded within Homeric phraseology. Finally, the volume concludes with an afterword devoted to the Anglo-Saxon Deor and its own particularized employment of traditional “signs.”


A brief biographical sketch of Milman Parry’s life, with particular emphasis on his contributions to the development of Oral-Formulaic Theory. Also includes a very helpful bibliography of others scholars’ accounts of Parry’s life and research.
“Proverbs and Proverbial Function in South Slavic and Comparative Epic.” *Journal of Indian Folkloristics*, n.s., 1:37-49.

A reprint of “Proverbs and Proverbial Function in South Slavic and Comparative Epic” (1994).


An overview (translated by Foley) of the history of modern scholarship surrounding the phrase “winged words” in Homer and discusses the various ways in which the phrase can work in order to dovetail with additional formulaic elements within the verse.


An overview of Lord’s life and scholarship, focusing especially on his comparative methods and his role in the development of Oral-Formulaic Theory.


In responding to Wyatt’s review, reaffirms the importance of 1) giving greater significance to the “tradition” component of “oral tradition,” 2) employing the South Slavic analogy to Homer in finely calibrated ways, and 3) understanding Homeric phraseology as “words” that do not always correspond to literate conceptions of words more generally.


Uses a comparison of Homer and the “legendary singer” figure within South Slavic oral epic to demonstrate that 1) the legendary singer (though presented as real) metonymically designates the entire poetic tradition, 2) various constructions of the legendary singer’s identity demonstrate the concept of “variation within limits,” and 3) traditional referentiality allows us to understand the legendary singer as a sign working in conjunction with both situation-specific and traditional values. Includes extensive discussion of South Slavic singers’ (and other informants’) accounts of Hasan Ćoso, Isak, and Ćor Huso Husović, as well as an epilogue describing the figure of Choibang as described in Inner Mongolia.

A slightly modified version of pp. 119-57 of Homer’s Traditional Art (1999).

“Textualising the Siri Epic.” Indian Folklife, 1.2:22-32.

A reprint of “Experiencing the Siri Epic” (1999).


A fascinating overview of the collection and publication processes employed by two separate teams of South Slavic oral epic collectors: 1) Vuk Karadžić with his team of amanuenses and 2) Milman Parry and Albert Lord along with their assistant Nikola Vučnović. Special attention is paid to the choices made by each team with regard to what was recorded and what then was published. Some concluding remarks offer the possibility that there may be some relevance of South Slavic “performatives” for understanding Homeric metrics as well as the reminder that readers of Beowulf today lack a traditional context and fluency for appreciating that poem in all its fullness.


A report from Workshop II at the 1999 Folklore Fellows’ Summer School. The workshop’s dual focus was on “acquiring a ‘menu’ of approaches to understanding oral and oral-derived traditional epics” (with a particular concentration on oral-formulaic theory, performance theory, and ethnopoetics) and “demonstrating the inherent diversity of the complex expressive systems—or registers—within the traditions represented” by the group’s members (13). Includes participants’ discussions on these issues within the following areas: Romanian epic, Swedish folktales, Turkmen epic, Persian epic, Old English poetry, Tamil bow-song performance, Altay epic, Siri epic, Kalevala-metric oral poetry, Yi oral traditions, Lönrodt’s textualization of the Kalevala, Mongolian epic, and South Slavic epic.


Translation of “The Impossibility of Canon” (1998).


An overview of historical and methodological approaches toward oral poetry, moving from early misunderstanding and definition through text-based ideas of how oral poetry is somehow deficient or different from written poetry to an eventual acceptance of its complexity and dependence upon traditional processes. Also included are summaries of Oral-Formulaic Theory, the orality-literacy debate, Ethnopoetics, and performance theory.


Somewhat in the same vein as “Strategies for Translating Serbo-Croatian Traditional Oral Narrative” (1991), this essay seeks “to sketch a strategy for resisting the ravages of time and intersemiotic translation, that is, for presenting English-language renderings of the Karadžić pjesme that recover at least some of the echoes of performance and traditional style” (191) through a combination of Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Performance/Ethnopoetics/Ethnography of Speaking approaches. Proposes that such an anthology of translations might 1) present the poems against the background of the Serbo-Croatian oral narrative tradition as a whole and the Karadžić collection in particular, 2) arrange the poems according to important figures and situational events rather than by genre, and 3) encode the translated text (through placement in the collection and consistent renderings of recurrent phraseological and narrative units that call attention to their employment) with extralexical meanings drawn from the tradition itself.


A foreword to a volume devoted to collaboration and interpretation within the context of editing and translating Native American oral traditions. Illustrates through examples the importance of “erasing some firmly drawn lines of identity and responsibility—between performance and interpretation, between insider and outsider, and between Native and scholar” (viii).

Begins with an “Almanac of Proverbs” consisting of homemade nuggets of wisdom to be kept in mind when appreciating oral traditions: 1) Oral traditions work like language, only more so; 2) Performance is the enabling event, tradition the enabling referent; 3) Composition and reception are two sides of the same coin; 4) *Artis causa*, not *metri causa*; 5) Read both behind and between the signs; and 6) Instance meshes with implication. Then proceeds to illustrate how Homer’s *Odyssey* and the Anglo-Saxon *Deor* can be better understood by reading their “signs” through their indexical function and thus by unlocking their traditional referentiality.


A brief biography of Parry focused on his development of Oral-Formulaic Theory and the tradition of scholarship from which it emerged.


Meant as an introduction for non-specialists to the contexts, plurality, and—above all—interpretation of oral poetry, the volume begins by providing four scenarios (involving a Tibetan paper-singer, a North American slam poet, a South African praise-poet, and an ancient Greek bard) that demonstrate the widely divergent possibilities that exist for oral poetry. The next section (“What the Oral Poets Say [in Their Own ‘Words’]”) then narrows the focus to what the South Slavic *guslar* have to say about *reči* (“words”), thereby moving readers away from a preconceived literate and textual understanding of words as fixed items printed on a page and thus toward a conception of a “word” as a flexible unit of utterance that varies in size and form according to its functional role in the communicative process.

The first “word,” then, seeks to answer the question “What is oral poetry?” by breaking down the oral/written dichotomy itself and by investigating common structuring techniques for four different categories of verbal art: “oral performance,” “voiced texts,” “voices from the past,” and “written oral poems” (39)—labels that designate the poetry according to its oral/aural or written nature with regard to composition, performance, and reception. “The Second Word” continues by using these categories to explore the importance of context (performance-based or otherwise) in interpreting such works of art, which in turn entails a reevaluation of what it means to “read” oral poetry, with the appropriate goal being to decode the signs provided by the poet in light of their context- and tradition-enhanced meanings.

The next few sections of the volume then provide a theoretical framework for interpreting these oral poems, with discussions of performance theory (and especially Bauman’s “keys to performance”), ethnopoetics (with specific application to slam poetry and *Beowulf*), and immanent art (involving questions of structure and word-power). These theoretical discussions are then followed by an “almanac” of
homemade proverbs that, when kept in mind, can guide a reader toward more faithful interpretation of oral poetry: 1) Oral poetry works like language, only more so; 2) *oral poetry* is a very plural noun, 3) Performance is the enabling event, tradition is the context for that event; 4) The art of oral poetry emerges *through* rather than *in spite of* its special language; 5) The best companion for reading oral poetry is an *un*published dictionary; 6) The play’s the thing (and not the script); 7) Repetition is the symptom, not the disease; 8) Composition and reception are two sides of the same coin; 9) Read behind and between the signs; and 10) True diversity demands diversity in frame of reference.

The next two “words” provide direct application of the previously developed theoretical framework to the poems themselves. First, “Reading Some Oral Poems” demonstrates the usefulness of these approaches through investigation of Zuni *telapnaawe*, Guatemalan stories surrounding Hermano Pedro, contemporary slam poetry, the *Odyssey*, the *Siri Epic* from India, and the Medieval French *Song of Roland*. Then, the “Eighth Word” focuses on South Slavic poetry and discusses the necessity of understanding and reading these poems on their own terms as various genres that collectively make up a thriving and widely diverse ecological system of poetry and performance.

Finally, a short (and cleverly titled) Post-Script concludes the volume by discussing briefly the similarities between oral poetry and the Internet as well as the potential for new technologies to better capture and understand those oral performances that are not easily reduced into textualized form without a great loss in their signification power.


A response to four essays from the previous issue of the *Journal of American Folklore*, all of which addressed aspects of James Macpherson’s figure of Ossian and his poetry that purportedly translated poems from an ancient Gaelic oral tradition. Suggests that comparative parallels (drawn from the South Slavic, Old English, Finnish, and several other traditions) can help resist oversimplification of the issues involved and thus contribute beneficially to the ongoing dialogue surrounding Macpherson’s work.


Begins by arguing (with South Slavic examples providing the main body of evidence) that the “pool of tradition” can be considered to encompass everything that is institutionally implied through the act of performance, an implication that relies heavily upon the ideas of the performance arena, register, and communicative economy. Successful access to this pool is then granted through the process of metonymy by which traditional signals key larger meanings generated by the tradition; however, the success of these signals is largely dependent upon both performer and audience choosing the same channel of communication. Within works of verbal art that are preserved only as texts, the persistence of these traditional meanings will then rely upon the reader’s ability to understand these traditional signals and their meanings even after they have been removed from the original performance arena.

A further step toward fine-tuning the analogy between South Slavic epic and Homer through the understanding that 1) fruitful comparison between traditions must also involve acknowledgement of their contrasting or dissimilar features, 2) “oral traditions work like language, only more so” (55) with respect to their inherent structures and techniques for creating meaning, and 3) “oral poetry” exists not as a monolithic entity but as a spectrum of verbal art containing categories such as “oral performance,” “voiced texts,” “voices from the past,” and “written oral poetry.”


Uses comparative forms of the Return Song (primarily from within the South Slavic tradition but also more widely from other Indo-European traditions as well) in order to elucidate aspects of the Odyssey’s narrative arrangement, the ambiguity of Penelope’s character, and the telos of the epic.


Outlines Foley’s further-developed strategies for creating English-language translations of South Slavic oral epic. With a goal of minimizing the effects of textualization and translation, first proposes helping the reader re-create the performance arena and traditional context for a translated poem through description of the original setting, performance assumptions, and personal tendencies of the individual singer. Also suggests that the multiforality of the “text” can perhaps best be represented through hypertext media, and tradition-enabled meanings can be made apparent to the reader through footnotes and especially an “apparatus fabulosus” that functions to notify the reader of traditional, idiomatic markers that might otherwise go unnoticed. Finally, after brief discussions of how the Old English *Andreas* can act as an illustration of how such extralexical meaning is important to emphasize even in translation and how the South Slavic epic register contains other peculiarities that must be accounted for in translation, the essay concludes with an appendix providing a sample annotated translation drawn from the first 51 lines of *The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bečirbey* as performed by Halil Bajgorić.

Treats traditional verse as “an ecology of genres” involving constant shifting and interaction so that generic characteristics get shared across boundaries in systematized and predictable ways. Ancient Greek (where the shared hexameter and its regularized structuring allows leakage between epic and the Homeric Hymns) and South Slavic (where social function, subject matter, meter, and gender issues regulate the degree of leakage between different genres) are explored as comparisons for Old English verse where “various genres annex diction and narrative patterns that seem to attach principally to no single genre, but are shared at the level of the larger poetic tradition” (102).


A survey of oral traditions from around the world aimed at providing context and background for understanding Basque oral improvisation.


Explores some of the possibilities for employing electronic media to assist in producing enhanced and more faithful editions of oral poetry performances, with a particular focus on South Slavic oral epic and the “E-companion” to *The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bećirbey as Performed by Halil Bajgorić* (2004).


After illustrating the wide diversity of poems often classified as epic from around the world, posits that no specific set of criteria is universally capable of defining epic successfully across all cultures, times, and traditions. Then proceeds to examine the concept of epic in relation to Homeric poetry in particular, discussing in turn issues of length, genre absorption, diction, narrative patterning, prologues, catalogues, similes, group identity, heroic content, and authorship.

Addresses the needs to “become more aware of the broad, remarkably many-sided spectrum of what we call oral poetry” and to “affirm a corresponding variety of approaches—a diversity in frame of reference—that can help us to wrap our text-bound minds around a highly elusive collection of phenomena” (12) by cataloguing several different types of oral poetry as well as particularly important methodologies helpful for understanding this poetry on its own terms.


Revisits the comparison between South Slavic and Homeric epic through the framework of three homemade proverbs: comparison must always be tempered by contrast; oral traditions work like language, only more so; and oral-poetry is a very plural noun.


A lightly revised version of “The Textualization of South Slavic Epic and Its Implications for Oral-Derived Epic” (2000).


An edition and translation of *The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bećirbey* (performed by Halil Bajgorić for Parry and Lord in 1935) augmented by a large amount of supplementary material aimed at providing the reader with a heightened awareness of the epic’s traditional and performance contexts. The poem itself is presented with its original-language verses arranged side-by-side with their English-language translations, and all performatives, hyper-/hypometrical lines, and “mistakes” (from a literary point of view at least) are retained in the text. The text is then keyed to both a “Performance-Based Commentary” that “concentrates on sound, morphology, and traditional structure as well as lexicon, syntax, context, and translation” (77) and an “Apparatus Fabulosus” meant to explain the poem’s structure and idiomatic meanings by glossing them through reference to their counterparts found elsewhere in the South Slavic oral poetic arena. Further information is provided through sections devoted to a “Portrait of the Singer,” a synopsis of the story (both in traditional terms and with respect to this specific performance), an analysis of Nikola Vujnović’s original transcription decisions concerning this song, the role of music (by H. Wakefield Foster), and a discussion (by R. Scott Garner) of the singer’s particular tendencies in his use of performatives to avoid hiatus.

An illustration of how comparison with modern oral epics can provide a better understanding of ancient epic. Specifically addressed issues involve the widely divergent characteristics of what is called “epic” in various cultural contexts; descriptions of singers both real and legendary; the roles of performance and audience; epic register and language; oral transmission of epic; the ability of singers to create “new” epics; the effects of literacy, collection, textualization, and editing with respect to oral epics; and the ecology of genres surrounding epic in an oral poetic environment.


A wide-ranging overview of oral traditions from around the world provided as a context for interpreting Basque oral improvisation.


Proceeding from the observation that conducting fieldwork with regard to oral traditional poetry requires one to “be ready to learn the language of oral tradition from the inside out, on its own terms, as thoroughly as you can” (17), investigates Homeric poetry to uncover the traditional implications of the phrases *apereisi' apoina* (“boundless ransom”) and *nositmon émar* (“day of return”).


Investigates what various oral traditional practitioners themselves (namely, an Anglo-Saxon *scop*, South Slavic *guslari*, and an ancient Greek *aoidos*) have to say about the role of memory. Finds that rather than understanding it as a static retrieval mechanism, these verbal poets consider memory to be a kinetic and creative activity that enables meaning to be created for an audience through performance.

An overview of the different components of the book-based and electronic versions of *The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bećirbey as Performed by Halil Bajgorić* (2004), with the goal of explaining the rationales and advantages for each type of presentation.


Examines various aspects of Oral-Formulaic Theory and the applicability of the South Slavic analogy to Homer through three selected homemade proverbs: 1) Comparison must always be tempered by contrast; 2) Oral traditions work like language, only more so; and 3) Oral-poetry is a very plural noun.


A collection of 42 essays meant to provide assistance to readers of ancient Near Eastern, Greek, and Roman epic. The essays of Part I (“Issues and Perspectives”) address the larger concerns and approaches toward ancient epic more generally through discussions of epic as genre; the Indo-European context for ancient epic; the relation of ancient epic to myth, performance, history, and archaeology; epic heroes, gods, and women; the textualization, reception, and translation of ancient epic; and modern oral analogues. Part II is then devoted to exploring Near Eastern epic, with contributions focusing on Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, Hittite and Hurrian, Persian/Iranian, and Israelite epic. Part III then moves on to Greek epic, beginning with its Near Eastern connections and then discussing Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (as well as their post-classical legacies), Hesiod, the epic cycle, Apollonius of Rhodes, Quintus of Smyrna, Nonnus, and the relation of epic to other genres in the Greek world. Part IV then closes out the volume by first discussing the origins of Roman epic and its defining characteristics, then proceeding chronologically from the early Republican period to Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Lucretius, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Silius Italicus, Claudian, and the Latin Christian epics of late antiquity, and concluding with discussions of epic’s position with respect to other Roman genres and a final overview of Virgil’s post-classical legacy. The 42 individual contributions, then, provide not only individualized treatments of specific topics, but work together to form a comprehensive volume dedicated to understanding epic in the ancient world. (A brief introduction by Foley is also included at the beginning of the Companion.)


A comparison of oral tradition and the Internet with particular discussion of 1) variation within limits, 2) the role of the performer/surfer, and 3) the phenomenon of “words” not being textual units but idiomatic addresses. Closes with discussion of electronic media as relevant to How to Read an Oral Poem (2002), The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bećirbey as Performed by Halil Bajgorić (2004), and The Pathways Project (2011-).


After demonstrating that comparative parallels indicate that an Ur-text for Q was unlikely (though a non-textual oral traditional precursor might have been possible), reviews three papers (by Werner Kelber, Jonathan Draper, and Richard Horsley) and two responses (by Joanna Dewey and Vernon Robbins) originally presented within sessions at the Society for Biblical Literature Annual Meetings. Closes by suggesting that the concept of a “voiced text” is perhaps the one category of oral tradition most applicable to Q.


Translation of “The Textualization of South Slavic Epic and Its Implications for Oral-Derived Epic” (2000).


A report from the 2005 national championship of Basque oral poetry (bertsolaritza) held in Barakaldo, Spain. Frequent parallels are drawn between this improvised contest poetry and other traditions from around the world.


A history of the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition with emphasis on its embracing of the possibilities afforded by the Internet for making its materials more widely available to those most in need of them.

Describes the various strategies behind the development of eCompanions and eEditions at the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition as well as for the creation of the Pathways Project.


Demonstrates how the Homeric Question was forever changed by Parry and the development of Oral Theory, and then provides examples (alongside South Slavic parallels) of how “words” as traditional utterances work in Homer with respect to both compositional practices and traditional meanings.


A roundtable discussion with Thomas Cable and Mark Amodio concerning aspects of oral tradition as related to *Beowulf*.


Provides overviews on several issues related to *Beowulf*, including oral performance, historical and traditional contexts, linguistic and archaeological concerns, manuscript history, and instrumentation.


An introduction to *The Canterbury Tales* and also more specifically to Raffel’s particular translation. Includes helpful information concerning the cultural attitudes and traditions (literary or otherwise) that provided a background for Chaucer’s work; notes on the arrangement, contents, and completeness of *The Canterbury Tales*; overviews of Chaucer’s own individual genius as expressed in this and other works; reviews of the critical approaches that have been taken toward interpreting Chaucer; and an appraisal of Raffel’s techniques of translation as related to Chaucer’s own stylistic tendencies.

Describes several of the endeavors undertaken at the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition and the Center for eResearch, with a focus on introducing the Pathways Project. Additional discussion is focused around the similarities and differences among oral, textual, and electronic technologies.

2009  

Suggests that the logical inconsistencies of *Odyssey* 4.512-22 are the result of traditional associations with Cape Maleia being paired with the Return Song story-pattern to override any expectations of actual physical geography.

2010  

Begins by tracing developments in the theoretical understanding of oral traditions from the original comparisons of Homer and South Slavic epic to the application of those findings to traditions around the world to refinements that emphasized concerns of performance and reception just as strongly as composition. Then discusses the various possibilities for categorizing verbal art along an oral tradition spectrum before summarizing several of the accomplishments of performance theory, ethnopoetics, and immanent art. Finally, after examining some points of contact regularly shared by oral traditions and then listing a few invented proverbs as reminders of core issues within oral tradition studies, concludes by describing some of the similarities between oral tradition and Internet/digital technology.


A reprint of “Reading’ Homer through Oral Tradition” (2007).


Posits that oral epic has the ability to create and maintain a view of history that functions on its own terms and with its own validity—even when seemingly at odds with what is often accepted as fact according to conventional historical methods. With South Slavic oral epic being employed as a test case, the argument is made that oral epic functions as a cultural charter for group identity, with “truth” being determined
dynamically according to what is important and relevant to the epic tradition’s participants at any given time.


After discussing his medium-based model for categorizing oral traditions, moves on to demonstrate correspondences between oral traditions and internet technology and then to provide an overview of projects that illustrate how the OT-IT homology can provide a deeper understanding of both media.


The entry for “Literacy” focuses on writing as a technology, paying special attention to the various routes by which it has arisen and developed in different societies. The entry for “Oral Tradition” emphasizes the rediscovery of oral traditions by scholars, proceeding from Parry and Lord’s early work to the eventual recognition of these traditions’ great diversity in various cultural and stylistic contexts.


Argues that the Internet and oral tradition both operate at their core by means of navigation “through a network of linked pathways” (142). Parallels are also drawn between the “variation within limits” exhibited in both media, the employment of complex “words” (for example, URLs and formulas) as emergent pathways, and the role of their participants in shaping the experience. Illustrative examples are drawn from the eCompanions and eEditions produced by the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition as well as from The Pathways Project.


A slightly modified version of “Plenitude and Diversity: Interactions between Orality and Writing” (2010).

Six encyclopedia entries with particular focus on the relevance of each subject for understanding Homeric poetry. The entry for “Avdo Medjedović” provides a brief biography of the singer before summarizing his performances and conversations recorded by Parry and Lord. Entries for “Oral-Derived Text” and “Oral Dictated Text” center on how these terms might be applied to the Iliad and Odyssey and affect our understanding of these works. The entry for “Oral Traditions” traces the development of several theoretical approaches toward works deriving from such traditions, with the entry for “South Slavic Heroic Epic” then providing a concrete example of how such approaches have been influential in better understanding the Homeric texts. Finally, the entry for “Theme” traces research concerning this structural entity from its early definition by Lord to its applications in various traditions and its ramifications for aesthetics and meaning.


A review of Oral Theory with respect to medieval literature and with a particular concentration on oral-derived Old English literature. Section 1 details early contributions of Parry and Lord as well as the philological and anthropological contexts in which Oral Theory arose. Section 2 surveys more recent contributions and methodological developments categorized under five main headings: “Expanding the Traditional Formula,” “Comparative Approaches,” “Middle English Literature,” “Manuscript Transmission,” and “Performance and Reception.” Section 3 then concludes the piece by identifying several opportunities for further research within the field.


An augmented version of the “Portrait of the Singer” section of The Wedding of Mustajbey’s Son Bečirbey as Performed by Halil Bajgorić (2004). An English summary is appended to the end of the essay.


An ever-evolving website focused on exploring and illustrating the fundamental similarities and correspondences between oral tradition and the Internet. Aspects of the site include a network of linked topics (called “nodes”), suggested reading-routes through those nodes (called “linkmaps”), audio and video eCompanions, multimedia eEditions, and a moderated forum for user contributions. See the entry for Pathways of the Mind: Oral Tradition and the Internet (2012) for a description of the book that acts as a companion to this website as well as for a description of the specific points of comparison this project makes with relation to oral tradition (OT) and Internet technologies (IT).

A “brick-and-mortar” extension of The Pathways Project (2011-) aimed at illustrating and explaining the fundamental similarities and correspondences between humankind’s oldest and newest thought-technologies: oral tradition and the Internet. Argues that both technologies are radically alike in depending not on static products but rather on continuous processes that mime human thought by advancing along pathways within a network; in both media it is these pathways—not things—that matter most. To illustrate these ideas, the volume is thus designed as a “morphing book,” a collection of linked nodes that can be read in innumerable different ways, thereby challenging the default medium of the linear book itself while also pushing readers toward a better understanding of alternative media-technologies and the communication strategies they entail.


Seeks to answer the question “What difference does it make that *Beowulf* was performed?” by suggesting that an audience aware of the poem’s roots in performance (even if the specifics of the original performance context cannot be re-created with certainty) will be more receptive to the epic’s performance keys and their attendant communicative implications. By drawing upon parallels from South Slavic oral epic, the case is made that the performance tradition has embedded extralexical meanings within *Beowulf* that can be more easily recovered by understanding the formulas and type-scenes of the poem in terms of their original signification within an active performance medium.

In Press


Demonstrates that South Slavic oral epic is at the same time a collectively and individually driven phenomenon, with issues of pan-traditional language, dialect, and idiolect coming together to create individualized but pattern-driven registers within a context of “distributed authorship” inherent within the overarching poetic tradition.

Updates to the earlier entries (1993) that take into account recent developments, especially in connection with aesthetics and meaning.


Proposes an alternative to the text-based model of a Greek epic cycle through understanding the surviving texts and fragments as representing “possible instances of the epic stories surrounding the Trojan War and related events, instances that at some point took shape as fixed and stable (even if partial) entities, but which once existed as malleable story-patterns that featured and fostered variation within limits.” Oral epics from South Slavic, Russian, Arabic, African, Central Asian, and Indian traditions are put forth as examples for comparison, and the chapter concludes with discussion of Cycle scholarship built upon the combination of neoanalysis and oral traditional poetics.

Additional Editing Projects

Editor and Founder, Oral Tradition, 1986- (26 volumes)

General Editor, A. B. Lord Studies in Oral Tradition, 1987-98 (17 volumes)

General Editor, Voices in Performance and Text, 1994-99 (5 volumes)

General Editor, Poetics of Orality and Literacy, 2004- (5 volumes published to date; 1 in press)